C. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On August 28, 2007, Applicants' representative, Amy Pattillo, conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Gillis. No exhibits were shown nor demonstration made.

First, Applicants proposed an amendment to claim 1 to clearly overcome the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Beyda. Claim 1 as presented in this amendment reflects the proposed amendment presented in the interview. In particular, Applicants noted that the proposed amendment to claim 1 incorporates elements of claim 2, which is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) under Beyda in view of Tech Target. In addition, Applicants indicated that no new matter would be added through the claim amendment. Examiner Gillis indicated that the proposed amendment appeared to overcome Beyda and Tech Target, but that additional search would be required.

Second, Applicants proposed an amendment to claim 15 to overcome the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 101. Claim 15 as presented in this amendment reflects the proposed amendment presented in the interview. Examiner Gillis indicated that the proposed amendment appeared to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101, except that the Examiner was unsure whether non-volatile media which includes punch cards would teach statutory subject matter.

No agreement was reached with respect to the claims.